Monopolists to Middlemen: Dutch Liberalism and American Imperialism in the Opening of Japan

Author(s): MARTHA CHAIKLIN
Source: *Journal of World History*, Vol. 21, No. 2 (June 2010), pp. 249-269
Published by: University of Hawai'i Press
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/20752949
Accessed: 31-01-2016 16:59 UTC

REFERENCES
Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:
http://www.jstor.org/stable/20752949?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

University of Hawai'i Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of World History*.

http://www.jstor.org

This content downloaded from 132.174.255.116 on Sun, 31 Jan 2016 16:59:43 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Monopolists to Middlemen: Dutch Liberalism and American Imperialism in the Opening of Japan*

MARTHA CHAIKLIN
University of Pittsburgh

THE Perry Expedition is widely regarded as a pivotal event in the histories of Japan and the United States. If a more nuanced view tells us that it was only one step in a large and complex process, the expedition and the treaty that resulted from it represent the first success of American gunboat diplomacy in the Pacific, and the beginning of the end of Japanese isolationism. As a result, scholars from these countries periodically return to reexamine the event. Some of the most recent of these studies in English include George Feifer, *Breaking Open Japan*, William McOmie, *The Opening of Japan*, and Mitani Hiroshi, *Escape from Impasse: The Decision to Open Japan*.[1] Traditionally, the success of this mission is credited to Commodore Perry himself. According to Japanologist Basil Hall Chamberlain (1850–1935): "To speak plainly, Perry triumphed by frightening the weak, ignorant, utterly unprepared Japanese out of their senses. If he did not use his cannon, it is only

* This paper was presented in a different form at the Southern Japan Seminar at Emory University in 2004. Thanks are due to Mark Ravina for organizing and inviting me; Tonio Andrade for suggesting me; and Victor Enthoven, Richard Smethurst, and Peter Karsten for carefully reading and commenting on drafts. Special gratitude to Herman Moeshart for generously sharing sources.

[1] George Feifer, *Breaking Open Japan* (New York: HarperCollins, 2006); William McOmie, *The Opening of Japan 1853–1855* (Folkestone, Kent: Global Oriental, 2006); Mitani Hiroshi, *Escape from Impasse—The Decision to Open Japan*, trans. David Noble (Tokyo: International House, 2006), originally published as *Peri raiko* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kobunkan, 2003).

Journal of World History, Vol. 21, No. 2
© 2010 by University of Hawai'i Press

This content downloaded from 132.174.255.116 on Sun, 31 Jan 2016 16:59:43 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

because his preparations for using them, and his threats of using them were too evidently genuine. . . . Might *is* right."[2] George Feifer's popular work continues this tradition. McOmie's book takes the more complex view that "For those for whom the 'truth of history' and the ideals of fairness outweigh the dictates of national ambition and objectives of foreign policy it is time to call into question that 'old' Japan was not the sort of oyster to be opened by one person or one nation all at once with a single slice of the knife."[3] Nevertheless, McOmie has accepted the widely held view that the Dutch were passive players in this event. He focuses more on Russian actions and summarizes the Dutch role with the statement that "the Dutch deserve credit simply for keeping open the 'Dutch connection' for more than two centuries."[4]

Given this long relationship of over two hundred years, it may seem odd that the Dutch would have listlessly watched as the world passed them by. It is easy to draw this conclusion from Japanese primary sources, which do not provide much insight to external actions, or American sources, which focus on their own triumph. If this had been the case, however, events would have unfolded in a completely different manner. The United States was not the first to attempt to open Japan since all Westerners except the Dutch had been expelled in 1639. Both the British and the Russians had made several attempts in the preceding two centuries that had all ended in failure. The French had made unsuccessful overtures to the Kingdom of Ryukyu. Even as the Perry Expedition was departing it was ridiculed in the press as a "romantic notion."[5] Many events converged to make the expedition successful, such as the delays to the Russian expedition led by Admiral Efimii Vasil'evich Putiatin (1803–1884) that allowed the American squadron to arrive first. Ultimately, however, the Perry Expedition to Japan in 1853 and 1854 that supposedly resulted in the "opening" of Japan was concluded with only a show rather than actual force because the Dutch had spent more than a decade laying the groundwork.[6]

---

[2] Basil Hall Chamberlain, *Things Japanese*, 5th ed. (London: John Murray, 1905), p. 364.

[3] McOmie, *Opening of Japan*, p. xvii.

[4] Ibid., p. 465.

[5] *The Public Ledger*, 18 November 1853, quoted in Inazo Nitobe, *The Intercourse between the United States and Japan: An Historical Sketch* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1891), pp. 43–44. This work summarizes a number of press reports in the United States and Great Britain.

[6] Some recent studies have begun to look at this in larger context but focus primarily on the period after Perry. See Minori Kogure, "National Prestige and Economic Interest: Dutch Diplomacy towards Japan 1850–1863" (unpublished diss., University of Leiden, 2008).

This content downloaded from 132.174.255.116 on Sun, 31 Jan 2016 16:59:43 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

After all, the arrival of Matthew Perry and the American squadron was a surprise to no one—certainly not to the Dutch, who had known of plans to this effect as early as 1849, and because the Dutch government informed and counseled the Japanese, it was no shock to the Japanese government either. A year before the arrival of Perry, a news report of the impending mission, which even listed the name of its commanding officer, was delivered to the Japanese government in Nagasaki.[7] Indeed, as far as the Dutch were concerned, they had "opened" Japan, not the Americans, as the title of the 1867 book by J. A. van der Chijs shows: *Neêrlands Streven tot Openstelling van Japan voor den Wereldhandel* (Dutch Efforts toward the Opening of Japan for World Trade).[8]

It is true that for centuries the Dutch East India Company and its successors had fought very hard to maintain their trading monopoly in Japan. It was a hard-won monopoly, gained by out-maneuvering the English East India Company, in both supply and marketing, and convincing the Japanese government that Protestants were entirely different from Catholics. It was this success that made the Dutch East India Company the only Western trading partner with Japan after the Portuguese were expelled in 1639. The shogunate subsequently resisted several challenges to Dutch status, such as that posed by Sir Thomas Stamford Raffles (1781–1826), lieutenant governor of Java. During the British occupation there, Raffles sent ships to Japan in 1813 and 1814. Napoleon Bonaparte's predations had left Japan as one of the few places in the world where the Dutch flag flew. Japanese factory head *(opperhoofd)* Hendrik Doeff (1777–1835) was able to convince those on board that the Japanese were still angry about the *Phaeton* incident in 1808 and would deal only with the Dutch. The HMS *Phaeton*, commanded by Admiral Sir Edward Pellew (1757–1833), sailed into Nagasaki and seized hostages to ensure that the Japanese would supply their ship. The Nagasaki magistrate *(bugyō)* committed ritual suicide over the affair, but the memory was fresh enough that Raffles was successfully shut out from his planned move into the Japanese market.

Precisely when Dutch policy in Japan began to shift away from monopolism is not entirely clear. Dutch jurist and philosopher Hugo

---

[7] A *fūsetsugaki* (news report) quoted in Mitani, *Escape from Impasse*, p. 104. In addition to *fūsetsugaki*, knowledge of imminent American arrival can be found in memorials to the shogun, reproduced in *Dainihon komonojo: Bakumatsu gaikoku kankei monjo*, 50 vols. (Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1973–2005), vol. 1; and *Shimazu Nariakria Monjo*, 3 vols., ed. Shimazu Nariakira Monjo Kankokai (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kobunkan, 1963–1969), vol. 3.

[8] J. A. van der Chijs, *Neêrlands Streven tot Openstelling van Japan voor den Wereldhandel* (Amsterdam, 1867).

This content downloaded from 132.174.255.116 on Sun, 31 Jan 2016 16:59:43 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Grotius (1583–1645) may have laid the foundations with the concept of *mare liberum*, or free seas, and his avocation of diplomacy over armed conflict. More significant is the later spread of Liberalism in Dutch political circles. Some attribute the beginnings of Liberalism in the Netherlands to Baruch Spinoza (1632–1677).[9] Spinoza's influence on Liberalism was, however, largely posthumous. Monopolist trade policy appears to have carried through the transitional period from the demise of the Dutch East India Company in 1799 to the Nederlandsche Handels Maatschappij (Netherlands Trading Society)[10] in 1824, although Janus Henricus Donker Curtius (1813–1879), the last Dutch factory head sent to Japan, at one time claimed: "The Netherlands have always desired the opening of Japanese ports, in the general interest, and in favor of commerce. Attached disinterestedly to that policy, the Netherlanders have sought no privileges for themselves in Japan; but they have, in equity, desired and obtained treatment similar to that of others, when these favors were granted."[11] It appears, however that the change to Liberalist policy occurred in what should have been, for Donker Curtius, more recent memory, in the mid nineteenth century. As early as 1830, liberal attorney and later minister of justice Dirk Donker Curtius (1792–1864) met with King Willem II (1792–1849, r. 1840–1849) and told him that Dutch foreign policy needed to change.[12] The East India Company was a private company, but the company that formed after its collapse, the Netherlands Trading Society, was a government-private hybrid, with emphasis on government control. The king was in fact its largest shareholder. Willem's views were therefore given considerable weight in the actions of the Society.

The revolutions of 1848 left the Netherlands with a constitutional monarchy in which the king had restricted powers. Liberalism was at the peak of its influence in Dutch political circles. Liberalism as practiced specifically in the Netherlands emphasized not just personal freedom, but laissez-faire economic policy as well.[13] This was not just an issue

[9] See, for example, Lewis Samuel Feuer, *Spinoza and the Rise of Liberalism* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1958).

[10] Netherlands Trading Society, forerunner to ABN-AMRO.

[11] Francis L. Hawks, *Narrative of the Expedition of an American Squadron to the China Seas and Japan Performed in the Years 1852, 1853 and 1854* (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1856), pp. 85–86.

[12] F. L. van Holthen, "Thorbecke and Dutch Liberalism," in *Under the Sign of Liberalism: Varieties of Liberalism in Past and Present*, ed. Simon Groenveld and Michael Wintle, pp. 46–61 (Zutphen, 1977), p. 46.

[13] Henk te Velde, "Liberalism and Bourgeois Culture in the Netherlands, from the 1840s to the 1880s," in Groenveld and Wintle, *Under the Sign of Liberalism*, pp. 64–66.

This content downloaded from 132.174.255.116 on Sun, 31 Jan 2016 16:59:43 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

of the "small power politics" of neutrality but rather the material gain neutralism that added a tone of morality to political discourse.[14] Market forces favored Liberalist trade policies in the Netherlands. Industrialization in the Netherlands lagged behind much of Western Europe, so that free international trade policies created a growing export market and rising prices for agriculture, the backbone of the nineteenth-century Dutch economy.[15]

The spread of Liberalism in political circles led to a reexamination of foreign policy in the public sector. Popular journals such as *De Gids* published articles discussing the moral debt owed to the east.[16] This sentiment is expressed most famously perhaps by *Max Havelaar*. Written in 1859 under the nom de plume Multatuli (Latin for "I endured much") by East Indian civil servant Edward Douwes Dekker (1820–1887), the novel is a thinly veiled fictionalization of the author's experiences in Java from 1838 to 1851. Often equated to *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, a work referred to even within its pages, the complex novel centers on the efforts of civil servant Max Havelaar to stick to his principles of humanism in the face of widespread abuses and corruption in the colonial East Indian government. The book closed with a dedication to Willem III, prince of Orange and king of the Netherlands (1817–1890, r. 1849–1890), and questions: "I dare ask with confidence whether it is Your Imperial will: that yonder Your more than *thirty million* subjects be MALTREATED AND EXPLOITED IN YOUR NAME?"[17]

While the Japanese were neither colonized nor exploited by the Dutch, isolationism directly opposed Liberal ideals of laissez-faire. In addition to the Liberalist bent in trade policy, however, in political circles at least, the Dutch seemed to have held the view that the Japanese were equal as a nation rather than a Dutch colony or protectorate. As naval officer and instructor Willem Johan Cornelis Ridder Huyssen van Kattendyke (1816–1866) phrased it, "Japan, by observing the higher standpoint of the Western peoples, was challenged to enter with uprightness the circle of civilized nations."[18] This convic-

[14] For a discussion of this, see Kogure, "National Prestige," pp. 17–20.

[15] See Jan Luiten van Zanden and Arthur van Riel, *The Strictures of Inheritance: The Dutch Economy in the Nineteenth Century* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2004), pp. 187–240.

[16] E. H. Kossman, *The Low Countries, 1780–1940* (New York, 1978), p. 141.

[17] Multatuli [Eduard Douwes Dekker], *Max Havelaar, or the Coffee Auctions of the Dutch Trading Company*, trans. Roy Edwards (Leiden, 1967), p. 320. Italics and capitals in the original.

[18] W. J. C. Huyssen van Kattendyke, *Uittreksel uit het Dagboek gedurende zijn Verblijf in Japan* (The Hague, 1860), p. 2.

This content downloaded from 132.174.255.116 on Sun, 31 Jan 2016 16:59:43 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

tion makes their actions in the decade before the arrival of Perry in 1853 and after his departure understandable and explains why Holland was the country in Europe that gave the Japanese mission of 1862, the first to Europe since the sixteenth century, "the kindest welcome."[19] This positive attitude toward Japan might also account for the stark contrast between Dutch diplomatic and trading policies in Japan with their often repressive behavior in their colonies.

Concrete evidence of both Dutch desire to be seen as a friend to Japan and their treatment of the Japanese on equal terms can be seen in a letter to the shogun from Willem II, prince of Orange and king of the Netherlands, in 1844, advising Japan that it was in her best interests to open for free trade.[20] This letter was written with the assistance of Philipp Franz von Siebold (1796–1866). A naturalized Dutchman from Germany sent as a physician to the Dutch factory on Deshima in 1823, von Siebold opened a medical school in Nagasaki, astutely collecting information about Japan from his students by having them write reports as part of their language study. Although he received a lifetime ban from ever returning to Japan when goods prohibited from export were discovered among his effects, Siebold published several well-known treatises on Japan, including *Fauna Japonica*, *Flora Japonica*, and *Nippon: Archiv zur Beschreibung von Japan*. Von Siebold was an accepted expert who had in fact spent a great deal of time with both Japanese men and women, and von Siebold's aggressive self-promotion of these facts made him seem a logical choice for this role.[21]

The letter was sent on the frigate Zr.Ms. *Palembang*, commanded by Kapitein-ter-zee H. H. T. Koops on the first Dutch warship ever to visit Japan. It was written on parchment, sealed with wax, and decorated with a medallion that depicted the king's likeness on one side and the national crest on the other, sealed in a silver box enclosed in a red velvet case within a mahogany chest that was packed inside another worked chest with a key.[22] It took almost three weeks after the arrival

[19] Fukuzawa Yukichi, *The Autobiography of Fukuzawa Yukichi*, trans. Eiichi Kiyooka (Tokyo, 1981), p. 130.

[20] Akagi suggests that it was the Minister of Colonies, Jean Chretien Baud, who initiated the process, but this appears inaccurate. Rather, Baud just countersigned the letter. Roy Hidemichi Akagi, *Japan's Foreign Relations 1542–1936: A Short History* (Tokyo, 1936), p. 17; and Herman Moeshart, "The Conclusion of the First Dutch Treaty with Japan," *Crossroads* 5 (1997): 3.

[21] Herbert Plutschow has emphasized von Siebold's role in the creation of this letter, but he was appointed to this task by the Minister of Colonial Affairs and therefore his positions reflected theirs, not the other way around. See Herbert Plutschow, *Philipp Franz von Siebold and the Opening of Japan* (Kent, UK, 2007), chap. 3.

[22] Chijs, *Neêrlands Streven*, p. 52.

This content downloaded from 132.174.255.116 on Sun, 31 Jan 2016 16:59:43 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

of the Zr.Ms. *Palembang* to make all the arrangements for presenting the letter to the Nagasaki *bugyō*, an administrative position in the shogunal government that the Dutch called "governor." The letter was sailed to shore under salute by the ship's artillery and marched through the streets of Nagasaki accompanied by the music of the ship's music corps to the Nagasaki *bugyō*'s residence. A ship was sent from Edo to receive gifts that were "of little worth but were products of Industry, Art and Science that blossomed under our protection in the Netherlands." These gifts, which filled seventeen chests, included a portrait of the king of the Netherlands, a pair of crystal candlesticks, one vase, ten lamps, two pistols, one carbine, books, maps and a piece of the latest field artillery.[23] A translation of the Anglo-Chinese Treaty of Nanjing from 1842 was also provided, presumably to underscore the need to voluntarily lift trade barriers.[24]

In this letter, King Willem noted that the sovereigns of the Netherlands and Japan had never before exchanged letters because the government in Batavia handled trade and regular news reports. Now he felt compelled to break this silence because "interests of the state had to be handled from King to King." The Dutch were "filled with concern for the future of Japan." Willem described how Europe had benefited from free trade after the war of thirty years previous.[25] Recapping the events of the Opium War, he warned Japan of the crisis that might occur if the British decided to turn their strength toward Japan. The letter even contained several misquotes from the ancient Daoist philosopher Laozi to support the Dutch position that it was in Japan's best interests to open to free trade in friendly circumstances rather than through force.[26]

Later historians have found this letter "not unduly tactful," yet Katsu Kaishu (1823–1899), first Japanese minister of the navy, credited this letter to be significant in effecting the changes in Japan that were to follow.[27] Overall it was good advice.[28] The efforts taken to follow

[23] Greene, "Correspondence between William II of Holland and the Shogun of Japan A.D. 1844," *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan*, series 1, 34 (June 1907): 114. Chijs, *Neêrlands Streven*, p. 24.

[24] Chijs, *Neêrlands Streven*, p. 36. Neither the original language nor the translated version is specified, but one might assume it was translated from English to Dutch, or presented in Chinese.

[25] That is, the Napoleonic Wars.

[26] The letter can be found in its entirety in Chijs, *Neêrlands Streven*, pp. 47–52.

[27] Harry Emerson Wildes, *Aliens in the East* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1937), p. 216. Similarly Moeshart calls the letter "paternalistic" and "badly composed . . . if its intention had been to persuade Japanese leaders." Moeshart, "Conclusion of the First Dutch Treaty," p. 3. Katsu Kaishu, *Kaigun Rekishi* [History of the Navy], 3 vols. (Tokyo, 1973), 1:21.

[28] Mitani, for example, expresses this opinion. Mitani, *Escape from Impasse*, p. 54.

This content downloaded from 132.174.255.116 on Sun, 31 Jan 2016 16:59:43 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

protocol, appeal to cultural norms, and provide gifts, some of which were in fact of great worth, would indicate that Dutch efforts were sincere. Moreover, Dutch warnings were not without merit, as some, such as Charles Gutzlaff (1803–1851), a missionary of Prussian origin and Chinese secretary to the British governor of Hong Kong, advocated striking while the iron was hot after the Opium War and moving on Japan. Perry himself was not an advocate of peaceful negotiation, and he sent a report back of rumors that the Dutch were aiding the construction of defenses by the Japanese to support his belligerent position.[29] The Dutch government was very aware of these advocates of aggression, and decisions on how to deal with them were the subject of numerous communiqués.[30]

The royal dispatch was sent on immediately to Edo. Predictably, Japanese response to it was divided. Some, such as Tokugawa Nariaki (1800–1860), wanted to strengthen defenses and keep the borders closed. Others, such as Mizuno Tadakuni (1794–1851), advocated opening the country as a preemptive move.[31] Opening Japan was a radical position because a year previous, shortly after the Dutch factory had conveyed news of the Opium War, the shogunate had sent a notification to the nations of Europe that they had no interest in opening their ports to anyone but the Dutch and Chinese.[32] Unable to formulate a response before the requisite departure date, the Zr.Ms. *Palembang* departed empty-handed and the answer went out the next trading season, in 1845. The response, crafted by Abe Masahiro (1819–1857), rejected all radical views about opening Japan in order to maintain harmony within the upper echelons of shogunal bureaucracy.[33] It was enclosed in a sealed chest and accompanied with twelve chests of "counter-gifts."[34]

The acceptance of the Dutch gifts and sending gifts in return was in fact a significant aspect in this exchange because reciprocity indicated an acceptance of diplomatic interaction. This is in stark contrast, for example, to the Russian-sponsored Resanov mission in 1804,

[29] Senate Papers 33rd Congress 1854, No. 34, 19.

[30] See for example, Governor General Pieter Merkus to the Minster of Colonies in W. G. Beasley, *Select Documents on Japanese Foreign Policy, 1853–1868* (London, 1955), p. 60; and Chijs, *Neêrlands Streven*, p. 16.

[31] Akagi, *Japan's Foreign Relations*, p. 18.

[32] Beasley, *Select Documents*, p. 76. The information was not conveyed to the British until 1847, apparently because the Dutch had not seen any possibility of it happening until then.

[33] Mitani, *Escape from Impasse*, pp. 52–56.

[34] J. H. Levyssohn, *Bladen Over Japan* [Leaves on Japan] ('s Gravenhage, 1852), p. 28.

This content downloaded from 132.174.255.116 on Sun, 31 Jan 2016 16:59:43 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

when none of the diplomatic gifts were accepted because Japan was not interested in opening negotiations. The Japanese response arrived in the Netherlands in 1846. The letter, signed by the *rōjū*,[35] stated that until now relations had been only for trade and were not diplomatic. It thanked King Willem for his friendly advice and wonderful gifts but politely declined the idea that Japan should open to free trade, saying that the Japanese government knew what was best for their people. The missive concluded by asking that a royal letter never be sent again.[36] While King Willem's attempt at diplomacy was a failure, it did stir up opinion about the matter of free trade within the shogunate and gave the Japanese government some indication of changes in the world.

The king's letter is concrete evidence of at least partially altruistic motives on the part of the Dutch king and government. The Dutch response was typical of hurt feelings rather than diplomatic maneuverings. Military sanctions and withdrawal from Japan were both considered in order to obtain an apology, but ultimately the relationship between the two nations continued unchanged. Moreover, after 1845 the Dutch policy showed a marked bent to furthering Japanese interests, serving, as the occasion called for it, as middleman for other nations during their dealings with Japan.[37] For example, the Dutch factory members were conscientious about providing the Japanese government with information. The Dutch had served as a conduit for news through *fūsetsugaki* (news reports), which had been a requirement of trade since the seventeenth century. While often accused of manipulating this information to their own benefit,[38] for the most part this news was reported quickly and accurately. The single notable exception was the French Revolution and the events that resulted in a temporary loss of nationhood. Therefore, the news that Lin Zexu had confined foreign nationals and confiscated and destroyed more than twenty thousand chests of opium in the spring of 1839 reached the Japanese by the summer. The following year, updates were provided on the deployment of British troops from the Cape of Good Hope and India to China for "revenge."[39] News

[35] A position in the shogunal government roughly equivalent to the cabinet.

[36] Chijs, *Neêrlands Streven*, pp. 60–61; G. Lauts, *Japan in zijn Staatkundige en Burgerlijke Inrigtingen en het Verkeer met Europesche Natiën* [Japan's Political and Civil Institutions and Their Association with European Nations] (Amsterdam, 1847), p. 290.

[37] Eelco Nicolaas van Kleffens, "De Internationaal Rechtlijke Betrekkingen tusschen Nederland en Japan (1605–Heden)" [International Legal Relations between the Netherlands and Japan (1605–Present)] (PhD diss., University of Leiden, 1919), p. 35.

[38] See for example, Wildes, *Aliens*, p. 217. Beasley, *Select Documents*, p. 40.

[39] Iwao Seiichi, ed., *Fūsetsugaki shūsei* [Collection of Dutch Reports], 2 vols. (Tokyo, 1979), 1:35–40.

This content downloaded from 132.174.255.116 on Sun, 31 Jan 2016 16:59:43 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

was provided in great detail on the course of the war. The knowledge of international affairs gained through the offices of the Dutch factory is known to have had wide repercussions within Japan, stimulating, for example, interest in modernization of military strategies and hardware. The perceived importance of this news caused the Japanese to demand separate, more detailed reports from the Dutch called *betsudan fūsetsugaki* because the standard offering had become formulaic.

Very specific details of American actions in the Pacific region were reported on; the change of command from John H. Aulick (1789–1873) for alleged misconduct[40] to Matthew Calbraith Perry, the names of the ships, and the fact that they would bring Japanese castaways with them, were all conveyed almost immediately. And in 1853, the Dutch reported how the vessels of the squadron were planning to assemble from various deployments in Asia in the Ryukyus before proceeding to Japan.[41]

The Dutch provided the Americans with a great deal of information and assistance too. In 1849, for example, Robert Browne, the Dutch consul at Canton informed the Americans of sixteen castaways from the whaler *Lagoda* who were being held prisoner in Nagasaki. Johannes Hendrik Levyssohn (1800–1883), the Dutch factory head, immediately tried to board the sailors onto the *Josephine Catherine*, then in Nagasaki, but was unable to accomplish this before it had to sail and could only send along an entreaty from the sailors for help. During their captivity, Levyssohn supplied these men with familiar items like coffee, sugar, butter, clothing, and even wine and gin. The United States dispatched the *Preble* under Commander James Glynn (1801–1870) to obtain their release, contrary to normal practice, which was to send foreign castaways who drifted to Japan to Batavia on a Dutch ship. Glynn operated with directness that the Japanese officials did not understand. He would have failed if Levyssohn had not assisted with the translations and served as a middleman to assist both sides to a successful conclusion.[42]

Similarly, in 1850, when the corvette *St. Mary* spent a few days in

[40] Officially the reason was given as ill health. Aulick made his last voyage in 1853 although he did not retire from the navy until 1861.

[41] Shunzo Sakamaki, "Japan and the United States 1790–1853," *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan*, 2nd ser., 17 (December 1939): 126–127. The English translations of the *fūsetsugaki* are provided.

[42] Fifteen sailors were repatriated and two of the original seventeen had died, but Glynn also repatriated Ranald MacDonald, who had intentionally gone there. See U.S. Senate docs. 3rd Congress 1851–1852 no. 59. These sentiments are stated by Glynn and Geisenger, who by that time was secretary of the navy.

This content downloaded from 132.174.255.116 on Sun, 31 Jan 2016 16:59:43 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Batavia before heading to the United States, Governor General Jan Jacob Rochussen (1797–1871) informed Commodore David Geisinger (d. 1860) of the latest news on affairs in Japan.[43] Another example might be found in businessman Aaron Haight Palmer, who campaigned the American government to send an expedition to open Japan through the 1840s. Palmer claimed to have sent sixteen large packets of letters and communications to the Nagasaki *bugyō* and other Japanese officials.[44] While Harry Emerson Wildes suggested that these packets were smuggled, they were in fact passed on through the offices of Baron Franciscus Matthaeus Winceslaus Testa (1806–1882), Dutch ambassador to Washington, to the Dutch *opperhoofd* (factory head) on Deshima from 1845 to 1854. J. H. Levyssohn received one of these packets just before his departure in 1850. Inside was a letter from Palmer, which Levyssohn disdained as unofficial, a copy of the one sent to secretary of state John Clayton (1796–1856) in 1849 that recommended that American trade in the East should be opened and discussing the fates of whaling ships the *Lawrence*, *Lagoda*, and *David Paddock*, and a report from J. B. King, chairman of the Commission for Maritime Affairs, as well as a number of copies of *Manufacturers and Farmer's Journal* from 30 September 1849, and reports on the geography, politics, and trade in Siberia, Manchuria, and islands in the North Pacific.[45] While Palmer is perhaps justly credited as a moving force behind the American expedition, he was viewed by the Dutch as a nuisance, "who awoke so many troubles between North America and the people of the East."[46] Yet they still passed these packets on. Thus, when planning the expedition to Japan in the first place, Secretary of State Daniel Webster (1782–1852) requested, through the ambassador to the Netherlands, maps and charts of Japan so that their ships could sail safely.[47]

All Dutch actions from at least 1844 onward indicated their willingness to act as middlemen. As early as 11 August 1849, Ambassador Testa met with Secretary of State Henry Clayton. Testa was quizzed extensively on Dutch relations with Japan, asked if there had been any

[43] National Archives of the Netherlands, Colonial Archives, 6529, no. 91 (hereafter cited as NA KOL).

[44] Claude D. Phillips Jr., "Some Forces Behind the Opening of Japan," *Contemporary Japan* 24, nos. 7–9 (1956): 431–459, 445.

[45] Levyssohn reprints a great deal of the contents, *Bladen*, pp. 66–80.

[46] NA Nederlandse Factorij Japan 1697 Letter from Testa, 26 June 1851 (hereafter cited as NA NFJ).

[47] Manfred C. Vernon, "The Dutch and the Opening of Japan," *Pacific Historical Review* 28, no. 1 (1959): 39–48. Vernon focuses specifically on the Perry Expedition itself and uses few Dutch sources.

This content downloaded from 132.174.255.116 on Sun, 31 Jan 2016 16:59:43 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

chance to spread the Bible, and told that the Japanese must have an opportunity to receive Christian civilization. Clayton told Testa that in order to receive better treatment for their whalers, the Americans would do as they had done in Malacca—flatten the cities on the coast. Clayton asked Testa to inform his government of these facts, and, if they felt it advisable, to inform the Japanese authorities.[48] In a follow-up meeting Clayton stated that the United States had gained cooperation from England, France, and probably Russia and now also sought the cooperation of the Dutch. Testa told him then and there that in his personal opinion, the Dutch government would probably decline because the Japanese had never given the Dutch a reason to go to war. Testa tried to talk Clayton out of some of his more hawkish impulses.[49]

As Testa's sparring with Clayton indicates, Dutch policy in regard to Japan was to be as useful to Japan as possible and still maintain equal footing with other nations when Japan was forced to open to trade. These sentiments are written explicitly in diplomatic briefs at least two years before Perry arrived in Uraga.[50] By 1852, the amount of correspondence between the governor general in Batavia and the minister of colonies concerning Japan increased dramatically. The impending expedition from the United States was by then widespread public knowledge. Newspaper reports appeared as early as October of 1851 in the *New York Journal of Commerce*, the *Hong Kong Journal*, and the *China Mail*.[51] By early 1852, newspapers not only in America, but all over Europe were reporting on the mission.[52] The inevitability of American action created a perceived need for a more Dutch-defined policy.

Acting on advice from Philipp von Siebold, the Dutch minster of colonies determined to take a more direct approach toward Japan because there was increasing concern about less than peaceful designs on Japan by the British and Americans. It was hoped that this direct approach would be all that the Dutch needed to avoid betraying Japan or opening hostilities with these nations.[53] In concrete terms, this direct approach consisted of another attempt to conclude a treaty between the Netherlands and Japan. The government in The Hague hoped that

---

[48] NA NFJ 1696, no. 22.
[49] Ibid., no. 39.
[50] See for example NA NFJ 1697 Ingekomen Brieven no. 9.
[51] W. G. Beasley, *Great Britain and the Opening of Japan, 1834–1858* (Surrey: Curzon Press, 1995), pp. 87–88.
[52] Several French and German reports are reprinted in Levyssohn, *Bladen*, pp. 89–112.
[53] NA NFJ 1696 from Twist to the Minister of Colonies, 8 January 1852.

This content downloaded from 132.174.255.116 on Sun, 31 Jan 2016 16:59:43 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

by taking the initiative they would be able to conclude the treaty, but it was also felt that with a treaty draft the Dutch could be ready to respond if the government of "the United States of North America" managed to conclude a treaty first. Governor General Albertus Jacobus Duymaer van Twist (1809–1887; who was vilified in *Max Havelaar*) feared that even if the Japanese did enter into a treaty with them or anyone else, it would be merely to "lead us down the garden path." Van Twist thought that if hostilities ensued, the Dutch should just leave Japan in order to stay neutral, promising to return when they were over.[54]

Dutch public opinion was predictably divided, with some conservative newspapers seeking to maintain the Japan monopoly out of patriotic pride, while others disagreed. The liberal newspaper *Handelsblad* of 8 March 1852 declared that "the barrier shall be lifted, and the kingdom of Japan will be absorbed into free trade." The paper went on to doubt rumors of an American warship on its way to force Japan open because it would "cost broad streams of blood." This journalist advocated skillful diplomacy by the *opperhoofd* as the solution to political tensions.[55]

Seeking to navigate these troubled waters, Janus Henricus Donker Curtius (1813–1879) was appointed in June 1852, replacing Japan factory head Fredrik Cornelis Rose, who had resigned. Donker Curtius was given special powers to negotiate a treaty that were not normally given to a factory head. Instead of the title of *opperhoofd*, which had been used for two and a half centuries, he was given the title Commissar for the Netherlands, because it sounded more diplomatic than commercial.[56] Already a member of parliament and a promising diplomat, Donker Curtius received careful coaching from Governor General van Twist.[57]

When Donker Curtius left for Japan he carried a treaty proposal, drafted by von Siebold and a letter to the Nagasaki *bugyō* from van Twist. The draft treaty stated that because they had relations for more than two centuries, the Dutch would come to the aid of Japan if they were attacked. It suggested that because whaling in the Pacific was of the greatest importance to seafaring nations, refueling and supplies be allowed; that Nagasaki be opened to free trade and other foreigners

[54] NA KOL 5831, NA KK 4252, NFJ 1696.
[55] Reproduced in Levyssohn, *Bladen*, pp. 115–118.
[56] J. L. C. Pompe van Meerdevort, *Vijf Jaren in Japan*, 2 vols. (Leiden, 1868), 2:7.
[57] NA KOL 6529, no. 118, 14 June 1852. Letter from the Governor General to the Minister of Colonies.

This content downloaded from 132.174.255.116 on Sun, 31 Jan 2016 16:59:43 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

be allowed on Deshima; and that because it was against Japanese law to deal directly with foreign traders, the Dutch could serve as intermediaries and protect the security of Japan from the Americans and other European powers. As import and export of precious metals was forbidden, it was suggested that trade could occur with Japanese copper currency, and, finally, most favored nation status was requested for the Netherlands.[58]

The letter offered the services of the Dutch as guides in future treaty negotiations, without any special provisions for the Dutch, to avoid any appearance of self-interest on behalf of the Dutch government. It also contained admonitions of the dangers to the peace in Japan specifically relating to the American expedition. It warned that the "United States of North America can stand with the mightiest nations of Europe. This means the fleet consists of exceptional steam and sailing ships! . . . His Highness is concerned of the future of Japan . . . If the question [of opening ports] must be decided with weapons, a long and bloody conflict is a foregone conclusion."[59] The Japanese officials in Nagasaki tried to decline the letter because of their response in 1845 that refused further correspondence, but Donker Curtius insisted, stating that the exceptional circumstances demanded it.[60] The Nagasaki magistrate, Maki Yoshiaya, was instructed by officials in Edo to treat this communication as a memorandum that did not require a reply. Consultations were conducted with key government officials. While no record remains of the content of these discussions, the apparent outcome was the decision to stick with precedent despite protests by those charged with coastal defense.[61]

The fact that Donker Curtius went through the Nagasaki *bugyō*, in contrast to Perry, who steamed into Uraga and demanded to see top officials, could be seen as evidence that Dutch policy in Japan was as stagnated as that of the shogunate, but it seems more appropriate to interpret Donker Curtius's actions as showing respect for local customs. Instructions to maintain traditional forms of interaction had in fact

---

[58] Chijs, *Neêrlands Streven*, pp. 79–85. Also, Hawks, *Narrative of the Expedition*, pp. 82–83. This treaty was drafted by Siebold and amended by van Twist. See Plutschow, *Siebold*, pp. 40–43; and McOmie, *Opening of Japan*, pp. 66–67.

[59] Chijs, *Neêrlands Streven*, pp. 79–85.

[60] Ibid., pp. 87–88.

[61] See Mitani, *Escape from Impasse*, pp. 106–115. Nagasaki *bugyō* Maki Yoshiaya left a report of the debate. Kuroda Narihiro presented a petition suggesting policy reforms in January of 1853.

This content downloaded from 132.174.255.116 on Sun, 31 Jan 2016 16:59:43 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

been specifically issued to his predecessor, F. C. Rose in 1852.[62] Barring explicit directions to the contrary, Donker Curtius would have therefore carried on in the same manner. Although Donker Curtius did manage to get the Nagasaki *bugyō* to accept the letter and treaty draft, the physical presence of the Americans and death of the shogun prevented him from obtaining a response. Even though Donker Curtius was unable to convince the Japanese to sign this treaty, which was more far-reaching than what Perry negotiated but also much more limited than what American consul general Townsend Harris (1804–1878) extracted in 1858, it served as a point of reference for later Japanese dealings with the Americans, and in fact appears to have been a model for the Treaty of Kanagawa negotiated by Perry.[63]

The failure of Donker Curtius's efforts may also be one reason that the Dutch response to the Perry Expedition sometimes appears to have been so inadequate. Van Twist felt that it was not possible to expand the relationship with Japan any further.[64] The Japanese were holding fast to the "principle of closure," and the governor general decided that if the Japanese were going to refuse to accept their help, that rather than initiate action, he would wait to see what happened in Japan.[65] Once the Americans did arrive, however, the Japanese sought the advice of the Dutch on how to answer Perry.[66] The Japanese were apprehensive that the American president would come personally to Japan and questioned the Dutch on how to best handle such a situation and as to why the other nations couldn't accept their policy of closure as a way to maintain peace. Donker Curtius was unable to convince Japanese officials that to open Japan was in their best interests, even after long discussions. Instructions were given that the Americans should be persuaded to go to Nagasaki, but that conflict was to be avoided.[67]

For their part, as the details of the American expedition spread, the Dutch were concerned that aggressive American actions would make their position in Japan very difficult. They correctly assumed that the

---

[62] Miyako Vos, *Bakumatsu deshima mikokai monjo—Donkeru kuruchius oboegaki* [Bakumatsu Deshima Secret Documents: Memoirs of Donker Curtius] (Tokyo,1992), p. 33.

[63] See a point-by-point comparison of the treaties in Nitobe, *Intercourse between the United States and Japan*, pp. 55–57. Aaron Haight Palmer also claimed to have been responsible for the treaty.

[64] NA KOL 6529 from Governor General Twist to the Minister of Colonies. No. 105, 24 May 1851.

[65] Chijs, *Neêrlands Streven*, p. 92.

[66] J. Stellingwerf, *Zijn Majesteits Raderstoomschip Soembing overgedragen aan Japan* (Zutphen, 1988), pp. 17, 19.

[67] Chijs, *Neêrlands Streven*, pp. 98–101.

This content downloaded from 132.174.255.116 on Sun, 31 Jan 2016 16:59:43 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Americans would not be satisfied with the arrangement of just coal supplies.[68] When Levyssohn's book *Bladen over Japan* (Pages about Japan) was sent to Japan, Donker Curtius worried that the fact that Levyssohn had written that the Dutch would support American attempts to open Japan would offend the Japanese and damage their relationship.[69] Not wishing to antagonize either the Japanese or the Americans, the Dutch sought to preserve their role as middlemen. Discussions in the lower house of Dutch parliament focused on how best to aid the Americans.[70] The factory on Deshima tried to assist by providing Japanese interpreters with English-language dictionaries so they would be able to interpret when the Americans ultimately arrived.[71]

In late 1853, the Nagasaki *bugyō* inquired after the price of a war frigate and a steam corvette. Plans had been made to offer Japan two steamships as early as 1852 although there was some fear that the Americans would perceive this as an aggressive act.[72] In 1853, however, Shogun Tokugawa Iesada (1824–1858, r. 1853–1858) followed up the *bugyō*'s inquiry by requesting by the summer of 1854 or as quickly as possible a frigate and a steam corvette, five or six corvettes, and two or three steamboats, a variety of military-related books, three thousand percussion rifles, and two models of steamboats.[73] Even at this late stage, the Dutch were asked to aid the Japanese in preparing a navy according to the European model. Curtius made fulfilling this request conditional upon Japanese agreement that the ships would not be used in war against a European nation. That of course did not include America.[74]

Although increasing numbers of daimyo and political thinkers had advocated strengthening the borders of Japan since the Opium War, the shogunal government had taken little concerted action. These requests, specifically generated by a desire to be able to provide a forceful response to the Americans, were therefore a revolutionary step in Japanese foreign policy. The Dutch, unable to provide the ships in time, fearful that the Japanese would balk at the high price, and fearful of how the Americans would react if met with such ships if they did come peacefully, felt it would be impossible to comply with this request. The

---

[68] NA KOL 6529, no. 127, 14 March 1853; NFJ 1688, no. 14.
[69] NA KOL 5861, no. 103.
[70] NA BUZA 3141. *La Patrie*, 15 December 1853.
[71] NA KOL 5861, no. 103.
[72] NA KOL 6529, no. 118.
[73] NA NFJ 1699.
[74] Stellingwerf, *Raderstoomschip Soembing*, p. 19.

This content downloaded from 132.174.255.116 on Sun, 31 Jan 2016 16:59:43 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Dutch government resolved to give the shogun one unarmed steamship for training as a gift and provide him with an electromagnetic telegraph and models of a railway and steam machine.[75]

In 1854, the minister of colonies finally requested a frigate for Japan motivated perhaps by his recent awareness of Russian plans to open Japan.[76] (It should be noted that while the Dutch were well informed about the Americans, they appear to have been less so about Russian actions, which were deliberately concealed from the Dutch diplomats in St. Petersburg.[77]) It was not easy to find a ship on such short notice. Attempts were made to obtain even a small commercial steamer. Finally it was decided to send the Zr.Ms. *Soembing*, a gunboat in the Netherlands East Indies naval squadron along with the telegraph that had been requested.[78] Unfortunately, the telegraph arrived badly damaged.[79]

The parties discussed a variety of payment options, an issue that was complicated because many restrictions were placed on foreign trade. Since 1685, specified goods were paid with copper bullion, and, in order to prevent the depletion of precious metals, all other goods had to be paid for in kind. This latter form of trade was known as the *kambang* trade, and since it was virtually impossible to pay for a steamship with the export goods permitted in *kambang* trade, the ship was given as a gift. As was traditional, the Japanese reciprocated with some rather spectacular presents. These included armor and swords, which had hitherto been illegal to export, as well as porcelain, brocades, screens, and fans (which were considered a sign of friendship).[80] Renamed the *Kanko-maru*, this ship became the seed of the modern Japanese navy.

Other nations, especially the Americans, interpreted the gift of a ship and other Dutch actions, such as a memorandum issued to the U.S. State Department that emphasized isolationism in 1851, as attempts to maintain the Dutch monopoly in Japan. It is more likely that these actions were triggered in protest of American methods, as the facts had already been accepted as inevitable and the Dutch had

---

[75] NA KOL 6529, no. 136, From the Governor General to the Minister of Colonies, 12 December 1853. NA KOL 5861, no. 1010, 19 March 1854.

[76] NA KOL 5861, no. 132, 15 April 1854.

[77] NA KOL 5861, no. 103, 20 March 1854.

[78] NA KOL 5861, no. 132, 15 April 1854; NA KOL 5864, no. 346, 19 September 1854; NA KOL 5866, no. 540, 29 December 1854.

[79] NA NFJ 1688 Geheim, 26 September 1853–1854, no. 31.

[80] *Katsu Kaishu zenshu* [The Works of Katsu Kaishu], 19 vols. (Tokyo: Kodansha, 1975–1983), vol. 17.

This content downloaded from 132.174.255.116 on Sun, 31 Jan 2016 16:59:43 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

been working to ensure that the transition was peaceful. In fact, the Dutch government had declined to assist the Russians in forcing intercourse in 1853.[81] Once the Treaty of Kanagawa was signed in 1854, the Dutch just wanted to make sure that no concessions were made to other nations from which they would be shut out, and to preserve the honor of the Dutch nation.[82] There was some discussion as what would occur if only the Americans were allowed in, but no specific policy was formed to only allow Americans in or exclude any other nation. In fact it was Perry that wished to keep other countries out.[83]

American suspicions of the Dutch have colored how Dutch actions are perceived. Captain James Glynn (1801–1871), of the *Preble*, an American ship sent to pick up a castaway whaling crew in Japan, for example, accused the Dutch of being "jealous" and seeking to protect their monopoly in spite of all the assistance Levyssohn had given him.[84] Philipp von Siebold had asked to accompany the mission, but even though Perry had his books in his library and possibly used his treaty of 1852 as reference, he was not allowed to play any active role in American efforts because Perry did not trust him.[85] Similarly, in the official account, *The Narrative of an Expedition of an American Squadron*, Francis Hawks outlined American views on the Dutch role. He doubted their sincerity in giving up their long-held monopoly; viewed Dutch acts of two hundred and more years previous as proof of their duplicity, as was the treaty attempt in 1852 that attempted to open Japan to all nations, "not particularly with reference to the Americans"; and thought Dutch claims of opening Japan were "exaggerated." Hawks blamed the Dutch for convincing the Japanese that their mission might be less than peaceful, and viewed Dutch efforts to maintain their own position in Japan as almost treasonous.[86] Some in the Japanese government also suspected Dutch intentions, believing that they

[81] M. C. Perry, *Correspondence Relative to the Naval Expedition* (S.1., sn: 1854), p. 80.
[82] NA KOL 5861, no. 101 Secret, 19 March 1854; KOL 5837, 6 January 1853.
[83] George Lensen, *Russia's Japan Expedition of 1852–1855* (Gainsville: University of Florida Press, 1955), p. 331.
[84] NA NFJ 1697, Letter from Testa No, 8 November 1851.
[85] Perry declined to use von Siebold partly because he did not trust him, and partly because they thought his banishment might prejudice the situation. Perry, *Correspondence Relative to the Naval Expedition*, pp. 86, 115. See also Aaron Haight Palmer, *Documents and Facts Illustrating the Origin of the Mission to Japan* (Washington, D.C.: H. Polkinhorn, 1857).
[86] Hawks, *Narrative of the Expedition*, pp. 80–87.

This content downloaded from 132.174.255.116 on Sun, 31 Jan 2016 16:59:43 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

were in collusion with the Americans.[87] No one could conceive that the Dutch government might act selflessly on behalf of their ally.

To some extent, Dutch interests and Japanese interests coincided. War would have denied the Netherlands any protection for trade interests. Therefore, when Perry was put in charge of the expedition, Dutch officials were ordered by the government of the Netherlands to assist him. Donker Curtius was specifically instructed to "contribute as much as may be in his power to the success of the entirely friendly visit which an American squadron is about to pay to the Isles of Japan." Unfortunately Donker Curtius had already departed for Japan by the time the instructions reached van Twist, and he feared that sending a man-of-war to Japan to convey these instructions "might raise suspicion with the Japanese government, which probably would exercise an unfavorable influence upon the negotiations in case such negotiations could be opened." Instead he offered to provide the Perry expedition with a dispatch that could be forwarded to Donker Curtius upon arrival in Japan. The Dutch factory confirmed to the Japanese government that Perry would appear with a "large American force" in the spring. It was also van Twist who informed the Americans of the shogun's death and the Japanese request for delay. Perry thanked him for it.[88] It is unlikely that Perry would have succeeded without the information and efforts of the Dutch over the previous decade. Donker Curtius was reputed to have said: "What is the significance of all the fine-sounding treaties on paper, when one knows beforehand that they are infeasible, and cause nothing but ceaseless difficulties, or creates such complications that relations with Japan will go much more backwards than forwards."[89] In other words, without Dutch mediation, American efforts at peaceful negotiation would have been to naught. An American or Russian version of the Opium Wars for Japan was not out of the question.

Even after Perry left, replaced by diplomacy in the form of American consul Townsend Harris, the Dutch continued to offer assistance. Donker Curtius advised the Japanese on trade and assisted them as best he could, translating the proposed Russian treaty in 1855 and pointing out significant differences from the American treaty.[90] It was also, for example, Donker Curtius who informed Harris of the Sepoy Rebellion

[87] Beasley, *Select Documents*, p. 109.
[88] Perry, *Correspondence Relative to the Naval Expediton*, pp. 20–21, 107, 111, 112.
[89] Pompe van Meerdervoort, *Vijf Jaren*, 2:7–8.
[90] McOmie, *Opening of Japan*, pp. 411–412.

This content downloaded from 132.174.255.116 on Sun, 31 Jan 2016 16:59:43 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

in India and forwarded newspapers and other information.[91] A letter from Donker Curtius to Townsend Harris stated: "Some days ago I had an opportunity to tell the Japanese, that in my opinion the honour and dignity of the Taikoon's [Shogun's] government require absolutely, that the American treaty should be signed . . ."[92]

In that same year, 1855, Donker Curtius worked behind the scenes assisting the English and providing translation for the French so they could negotiate treaties. He even translated Japanese documents into English so that all the parties involved would have a clear idea of the proceedings.[93]

American and English historians may have neglected the importance of Dutch efforts in Japan, but the Dutch were proud of their role as middlemen. As Johannes Lijdius Catharinus Pompe van Meerdervoort (1829–1908), a government doctor in Japan from 1857 to 1863, explained:

> It was sought simply to open up a few ports where in storm or in danger from sea damage, ships in transit could have a port of distress or shipwrecks could find a safe refuge; this was the principle demand, which the American envoy Perry conveyed to the Japanese government in 1853. A singular and highly fortunate confluence of circumstances were the cause that relations with foreign peoples were extended; it is these circumstances that I will now communicate, and I hope to thereby sufficiently demonstrate that the Netherlands has not acted in the same manner as the rest of the Powers, with heavily armed warships and imposing Armstrong guns, a treaty to extort, it was the peaceable and diplomatic way, going incalculably far, born of the circumstances which we beheld at that time in Japan.[94]

Dutch Liberals did not approve of English and American methods because the result was that "Men hate the Europeans in Japan like the plague."[95] Capitulation to gunboat diplomacy was a "national humiliation" that ultimately led to the end of the shogunate.[96] While it could be questioned whether Dutch efforts would have ever convinced the

---

[91] See for example, Mario E. Cosenza, ed., *The Complete Journal of Townsend Harris*, 2nd ed. (Rutland, Vt.: Charles E. Tuttle, 1959), pp. 394–395, 405.
[92] Chijs, *Neêrlands Streven*, p. 307.
[93] Vos, *Bakumatsu deshima mikokai monjo*, pp. 35, 162.
[94] Pompe van Meerdervoort, *Vijf Jaren*, 2:5–6.
[95] Ibid., 2:8.
[96] Mitani, *Escape from Impasse*, p. 54.

This content downloaded from 132.174.255.116 on Sun, 31 Jan 2016 16:59:43 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Japanese to open to free trade, the treaty brought by Donker Curtius served as the blueprint for future treaties and helped keep treaties concluded between Japan and the Western powers from being quite as unequal as those in China. Author and educator William Elliot Griffis called the Dutch "the silent leaven at work preparing Japan for her new modern life."[97] Dutch efforts were successful in keeping war at bay and tempering treaty negotiations.

Why then did the Dutch drop out of sight so quickly after the ports were opened? Dutch primacy in Asian affairs had been declining since the eighteenth century, but, more significantly, for all their experience in Japan they made some mistakes. Instead of moving diplomatic offices to Edo (now Tokyo), where the shogun resided, the Dutch embassy remained where it had been in Nagasaki. Thus, as one merchant in Yokohama complained: "We Hollanders have here but an assistant from Deshima as acting Consul, while the English, French and Americans are represented here with high diplomats as their subordinate consular authorities."[98] This made communication and, as a result, decision making slow. Eventually the Dutch were overwhelmed by much larger numbers of English and Americans. Nevertheless, Dutch nationals remained influential in many ways. In medicine, naval warfare, and engineering, Dutch *oyatoi gaijin* (contract foreigners) continued to act as middlemen for Western knowledge. Moreover, it was the decision of the Dutch government and its agents to enforce liberal politics in Japan and act as a buffer from other Western powers that helped enable Japan to make the relatively smooth and extremely rapid transition from a quasi-feudalistic shogunate to a modern industrialized nation.

[97] William Elliot Griffis, "American Relations with the Far East," *New England Magazine* 11, no. 3 (November 1894): 261. He goes on to say, "Holland prepared the way for Commodore Perry. The bluff commodore in 1854 merely inserted the thin end of the wedge." Ibid., p. 262.

[98] C. T. Assendelft de Coningh, *Ontmoetingen ter Zee en te Land* (Haarlem: W. C. De Graaff, 1879), 2:45.

This content downloaded from 132.174.255.116 on Sun, 31 Jan 2016 16:59:43 UTC
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions